



City of Carmel

CARMEL PLAN COMMISSION SPECIAL STUDIES COMMITTEE MARCH 7, 2006

Minutes

The Special Studies Committee met at 6:00 PM on March 7, 2006 in the Council Chambers of City Hall, Carmel, Indiana.

Members present: Leo Dierckman, Madeleine Torres, Susan Westermeier, thereby establishing a quorum.

Also in attendance: Mike Hollibaugh, Director of Community Services; city planners Christine Holmes and Adrienne Keeling; John Molitor, legal counsel.

The Special Studies Committee considered the following items:

- 1. Docket No: 05120025 Z 126th & Keystone/Gramercy PUD**
Traffic Discussion ONLY. This item will be heard from 6:00 PM to 7:00 PM
The applicant seeks to rezone 116 acres from R2/Residential and R4/Residential to PUD/Planned Unit Development for the purpose of creating a mixed use development comprised of townhouse, apartment, retail, and office uses.
The site is located between Carmel Drive, 126th Street, Keystone Ave, and Auman Dr.
Filed by James Shinaver of Nelson & Frankenberger for Buckingham Properties Inc.

Jim Shinaver, Nelson & Frankenberger. Present for Buckingham Properties: Brad Chambers, President, David Leazenby, Vice President of Land Development, Sara Nasuti, Development Manager, Murray Clark, Baker & Daniels, Counsel to Buckingham Properties; Gary Murray, Civil Engineer, Schneider Engineering; Steve Fehribach & Matt Brown, A & F Engineering Co.

The petitioner is proposing a mixed-use project for the gradual redevelopment of this site located between Carmel Drive, 126th Street, east of Keystone Avenue and west of Auman Drive. The mixed use would consist primarily of residential uses. The plan is to create an environment where people can live, work, and shop within a 5 to 7 minute walk of the site.

Jim Shinaver explained that there are several points of connection adjacent to the perimeter of this site. There are two reasons for this. Firstly, the connections are good site design and land planning; secondly, these types of connections are required by the Zoning Ordinance. However, the connections shown are preliminary in nature. The petitioner has been and will be continuing

to work with the DOCS and the Dept. of Engineering regarding the number and location of these connections. As explained during the first Plan Commission meeting, the objective of these connections and the internal road design is to improve the overall flow and function of the adjacent roadway systems. Currently there is only one way in and one way out of this site. The connections shown on the conceptual site plan should balance the traffic flow in a more efficient way to the adjacent roadways.

David Leazenby then addressed the Commission. In looking at the traffic issues in the area, it is important to consider traffic in the overall context of Carmel. There has been a lot of work and improvements on adjacent roadways in the core of Carmel. There are currently a lot of plans going on for improvements, specifically the Thoroughfare Plan that was created for all of Clay Township. In this particular plan, there is a planned connection to Auman Drive from the subject site and a connection to AAA Way from the site. The development plans do not necessarily depend upon the connections, but it is important to recognize that they represent good planning on the part of the City, The City Engineer, Buckingham, the Comprehensive Plan and the Urban Design Initiative. Access has an economic benefit and a value to residents and neighborhoods that depend on safe and efficient means of travel and circulation.

Steve Fehribach, licensed professional engineer in the State of Indiana, A&F Engineering, with offices at 8365 Keystone Crossing addressed the Committee regarding the traffic. In the late 80's or early 90's, Carmel developed its own guidelines for Traffic Impact Studies along with the State of Indiana guidelines—as traffic engineers, we must follow those guidelines set forth by the State and the City. Within those guidelines are how it is prepared, what items are to be looked at, how far out (timeline) is given, when the study is needed, what kind of improvements and what level of service.

A & F prepared the traffic study for this particular site and is currently working with the Engineering Staff to review this study and go over some items. Carmel guidelines, along with the State of Indiana and most communities that have them dictate to the traffic engineers that they must fix the system; the way we do that is by adding travel lanes at the intersections. The traffic guidelines force the traffic engineers to identify the deficiencies and then determine what can work in the future if necessary. How we do that is look at what is proposed on this site and generate the amount of trips—how much traffic in/out of the development—and put it to the roadway system. We took the land uses as proposed and added the traffic; then it was taken one step further. “Background traffic” was computed to grow 1 ½% per year for the next ten years. We picked a horizon year of 2016 and that is what we looked at. Along with that, we have to look at what improvements are currently being investigated or currently designed; those improvements are looked at with the added traffic.

The intersections looked at were 126th and Keystone Avenue, Carmel Drive and Keystone, and 116th Street along with all of the access points and the future connection along AAA Way. We looked at traffic volumes that will occur at AAA Way and the future connection. In doing so, we looked at existing conditions, existing plus the proposed development plus future traffic. When we took the existing traffic and added proposed traffic, we end up with an acceptable level of service at those intersections. When we take the traffic and add the 1 ½% along with the

improvements—added travel lanes on Keystone being looked at by INDOT—projected to 2016, we also end up with acceptable levels of service at those intersections. As traffic engineers, we have the model capability of looking at the future. We have identified deficiencies and by adding travel lanes, we can improve those corridors.

INDOT has looked at Keystone and determined it is an “added travel lane” project—one lane in each direction. A&F Engineering looked at this for Carmel to make sure that the State’s proposal will also work with the added traffic. At the time IDOT did their study, they did not know about the future lane. What we found is that some improvements will have to be made at the intersection of 126th & Keystone. Those improvements are basically necessary for the year 2016 after future traffic is added. If this development was built and then we quit, this intersection will work at the same level of service—we can’t say that for the year 2016.

What A&F is proposing by year 2016, based on every unit being sold, everything is occupied and density is all there, the project is completely filled—what we found in the east-bound direction is that we need a through lane, a left turn lane, and a right turn lane to move this traffic through. Likewise on the other side, westbound traffic would need the same improvements—a left turn lane, a right turn lane and a through lane. Both directions today already have a left turn lane and what is referred to as a “shared through and right turn” lane. We then took a look at this segment—basically a two-lane segment. We need to provide left and right turn lanes at these access points and A&F Engineering has recommended doing that.

Right now there are two lanes, basically an east-bound and west-bound lane. There are some tapers and a quick left turn lane—more a quick widening of the road. In this case, A&F has recommended a continuous lane along the north side of Grammercy, adjacent to 126th Street. We don’t have to widen to the north side of 126th Street because there is already right-of-way there. We would be adding a left turn lane and a right turn lane, continuous, so that if you turned off Keystone and you wanted to go into the proposed drive into Gramercy, you could get in the left turn lane and move all the way down and turn left. This is important because it leaves the through lane open for traffic that wants to continue east. You could travel north on Keystone, turn left onto 126th Street, and come all the way down and turn left into Gramercy. It is adding capacity because the left turning car trying to get into this development can accomplish that without being in front of someone going straight through.

Likewise, in the east-bound direction, we have called for a continuous right turn lane, the reason being that people will come across 126th and if they want to come into the proposed access into Gramercy, they can move into the right turn lane and free up the through lane for anyone wanting to get to the 126th & Keystone intersection. Capacity is actually being added by getting the turning cars out of in front of them. We are trying to prevent through traffic from slowing down while cars turn right and a right turn lane will accomplish that. Heading east, there is no dedicated right turn lane.

Because we are able to widen 126th Street along the north side of Gramercy, the right turn lane can continue to Keystone Avenue and become the right turn lane for Keystone. Now, we have improved the intersection by adding the right turn lane and cars can get into the right turn lane if

they want to travel south on Keystone Avenue and they do not have to get in the through lane. This is a very economical improvement.

Regarding the future AAA Way connection. The intersection of AAA Way and Carmel Drive is already signalized and this can be designed in order to accommodate the volume of traffic. This will be designed as a future roadway; a left turn lane, through lane, and a right turn lane can be added because it is an existing intersection. This is an easy intersection to design for the future.

Regarding the intersection at Carmel Drive and Keystone, INDOT needs to do their “Added Travel Lanes” project and it will get back to the level of service in the year 2016. This is a provisional job by INDOT, and that means they are looking at it, but there are no funds available right now. This connection onto Keystone is a right in/right out and we have asked INDOT to look at this. This is an important connection to the overall system. When talking about the overall system, it means all the way to Range Line Road. What can happen for the Auman Addition is that when the connections are made, whatever connections the Staff deems necessary, these people who live in this area can move through the Gramercy development and exit right onto Keystone into the system. Any vehicle in Auman Addition or Gramercy will be able to use either Keystone or AAA Way and will no longer be in the system, including Carmel Drive, Range Line Road, and 126th Street.

The reduction of traffic at the intersections of 126th and Keystone, especially in the east-bound direction, is important because every car that is in this approach will no longer need green time. We have to account for all of those cars and give them as much time as we possibly can to get the cars onto the roadway. Every car that we can develop at the Keystone access point is a car that does not occur on the side streets at Carmel Drive, 116th Street, or 126th Street. This is an important access point and we hope we are successful at INDOT. This is for people going south on Keystone Avenue. This is important because if people are coming across 126th Street and want to turn into Gramercy, now they do not have to cross Keystone and turn left into Gramercy—they can turn left at a signal with an arrow, come down Keystone and turn right into Gramercy. It is not a full access, so if you come northbound on Keystone, you will not be able to turn left into that drive.

At some point, people will come south to the signalized intersection, (Carmel Drive and AAA Way) make a left to come here, (Carmel Drive and Keystone) then head south on Keystone. That is the green time---it helps both AAA Way and this approach (Carmel Drive). If we are successful with INDOT, we can potentially even help the green time on the side streets and INDOT can run green time a little longer on Keystone Avenue.

Auman Drive—one of the things that is important along this corridor is that the recommended improvements are to replace the two existing lanes with 12-foot lanes, add curb and gutter sections along the east side and an eight (8) foot parking lane so that on-street parking can be obtained. By using the 8-foot lane, we will not obstruct any capacity on the roadway. The connections between Auman and Gramercy will add traffic that will move from Auman Addition over to Keystone Avenue. It is logical that the majority of traffic from Gramercy will move to

Keystone; the traffic will move to Keystone to 465 and to 31 north. There will also be significant landscaping along Auman Drive with streetlights and street trees.

David Leazenby clarified that there would also be an 8-foot asphalt path along 126th Street, Auman Drive would have a sidewalk along the Gramercy side; there would be a curb, planting strip, street trees, then the sidewalk—all of this is conceptual—the Engineering Department is still reviewing.

Questions from Committee:

Leo Dierckman: What is the parking on Auman Drive—who is the user, Gramercy or the neighborhood? What is the concept?

David Leazenby responded that Auman Drive would have public, on-street parking—the intent is to provide a buffer to the street and slows traffic, it provides transition from the street itself to the sidewalk and to the building. We are trying to create an appropriate transition with buildings facing the street. A sidewalk would be in front of the building, much more of a neighborhood streetscape type of feel.

Leo Dierckman asked Steve Fehribach what traffic would be using the new ingress/egress points along Auman Drive—what is the calculation?

Steve Fehribach responded that all together, there would be 50 vehicles that would move at the AM and PM peak hours through Gramercy onto Auman Drive to get to 126th Street and/or 126th Street.

Sue Westermeier asked if AAA Way and all roads were assumed to be built when the plan and traffic study were done and isn't Keystone a little "up in the air" right now?

Steve Fehribach responded in the affirmative, but said it was at the 2016 volume. AAA Way Drive is anticipated in being by 2016 as well as some lane improvements on Keystone. Keystone is provisional—there are no funds available at present.

Leo Dierckman asked why the access point is needed from Auman Drive and into 126th Street? It would seem to encourage traffic into the neighborhood and would serve as an outlet for cut-through traffic; 50 cars at the AM and PM peaks?

Steve Fehribach said that Auman Drive turns, then flows north to 126th Street. The count would be 50 cars in the peak hour. .

Leo Dierckman: What is the status of Keystone Avenue with the State relative to curb cuts?

Steve Fehribach said a report and request for curb cuts had been sent to INDOT—to date, nothing has been received from INDOT, however, the Department concurs with the request.

The State could take 30 days, but they may respond earlier.

Leo Dierckman: What is the road that is headed south, (not AAA Way) what is the continuation of that road or is there a road there already? Is this the Barnes property?

David Leazenby responded that as of today, there is no road shown on the plan. However, there is another proposal for this lot when the developer planned the property—Buckingham is only showing the connection. The property is not part of Buckingham's proposal and will not be in the short term. The property is not the Barnes property. For clarification: There are two different properties here—the former Marsh store, now The Fountains, and the property to the east that is referred to as the Barnes property. Buckingham is showing a street that would continue through to Carmel Drive—this is part of the Thoroughfare Plan. The time frame is not known at this point, but we are pretty confident that the connection will be made some time within the next 8 to 12 years.

Leo Dierckman asked what would happen if the connection (to AAA Way) is not made to the other points—from a planning standpoint, what would need to occur if that were never to happen? What additional improvements would be necessary?

Steve Fehribach said they are currently reviewing the situation and cannot answer at this time.

David Leazenby added that while the Thoroughfare Plan does show the connection, the intent is to provide a connection from 126th Street south to 116th Street. The alignment today is what Buckingham is showing to connect to the light. Could that happen in another way around the property? There are other ways to accomplish the goal—this is just the way it is shown at present.

Madeleine Torres asked if Steve Fehribach could further explain, for the benefit of the public and the Committee: the times the traffic was measured; how long it was measured; from what time to what time was it looked at; and over what period of time, two weeks—a month?

Steve Fehribach responded that all of the traffic is put on the system for the full build-out plus the year 2016. What we look at when we do that is the peak hours—AM peak hours and PM peak hours. "Peak" is the worst hour that can occur any time during the day. In this community, the majority of the peak time occurs in the evening hours and in the morning hours. Peak is known to occur at any time of day at other locations, sometimes lunchtime hour can be the peak. We want to be able to design the road or lane so that it can handle the worst-case peak time. When we talk about the peak hour, we do that for the one hour the lane will handle the most traffic—at three in the afternoon it will not be that bad, but if we take care of the peak hour, we have taken care of the other 23 hours of the day. The reason we look at AM and PM peak hours is because there are usually different flows in different directions; AM peak might be an east-bound problem, PM might be a west-bound problem. Therefore, the roadway would be designed to handle the lanes and traffic east-bound in the morning and west-bound in the evening—we look at all those things and the worst case scenario that can occur in the lanes. We literally count traffic between 6:00 AM and 9:00 AM and between 3:00 PM and 7:00 PM in the afternoon, due

to the retail component. We count seven hours of the day and find the worst hour in the AM and PM peak hours during the week, usually between Tuesday and Thursday—not Friday afternoon and not Monday mornings.

Leo Dierckman asked about the plan for the other ingress/egress points--at what stages will each be implemented?

David Leazenby responded that the plan is for those ingress/egress points to occur as different phases of the project are introduced. A formal phasing plan has not yet been put together. As different phases are introduced, the Plan Commission would review it under ADLS and exact locations would then be determined. Today, those are conceptually shown. Again, Engineering has yet to provide their direct input.

Leo Dierckman asked if on-street parking on the east side of Auman—the west side of the development—was included in the parking calculations?

David Leazenby said that a parking calculation has not yet been provided for the entire project. However, yes, on-street parking on Auman would be envisioned. Since it would be directly accessible, logic would tell you that someone would park in front of someone's house, then yes, it would be included.

Leo Dierckman commented that he would rather see parking on the opposite side: put the additional parking on the Gramercy side to provide more buffering. Leo did not want the residents in Auman Addition to have to look at cars parked across the street every morning. Leo definitely wanted to discourage such a situation and wanted to move the parking inside the Gramercy development.

David Leazenby responded that they were completely open and flexible with the design of Auman Drive and they have already included in the PUD Ordinance restrictions on height, no commercial, no backs of buildings, etc. If we do the front of the building facing the street, then on-street parking is consistent with that.

Leo Dierckman said the situation needed to be discussed with the Department relative to their desire. Leo said he would definitely discourage parking on Auman Drive—persons in residence should be able to look at landscaping or sidewalk and buffer—not the on-street parking.

At this time, Leo invited **public comments** and the following persons spoke:

Jerry Johnson, 741 West Auman Drive, agreed that on-street parking on Auman would not be a good thing and would only encourage people to drive in/out, park, and go into the Gramercy project—ideally would want to avoid as much traffic as possible into the area. Also, wanted to know how much traffic “In Total” this project will generate—50 cars during peak hours is a very low estimate. The 50 cars is dependant upon the Keystone exit—what if it does not get approved by the State? 50 is a lot of cars through a residential area. 20/20 Vision document states that.... “predominant site access to medium intensity residential areas should not directly utilize minor

streets which pass through low intensity residential areas. In addition to peak hours, how many cars throughout the day would be going through Auman Addition? The streets in Auman Addition were not designed to carry that kind of traffic. It is important that independent traffic studies from uninterested parties be utilized to determine the traffic flow and counts from Gramercy Park.

Henry Winckler, 411 Jenny Lane, representing Central Carmel Preservation Assoc. Cannot turn onto Ash Drive from 126th Street—must wait a long time—there are more than 30 cars on 126th Street alone. Keep in mind this is a settled community—we do not need a new development next door. Keystone is a scar to the community with the noise and traffic. We want to change priorities that are simply wrong right now: cars, traffic, road construction; commercial development; 3) residents concern—living conditions, environment, safety and ease of movement; must be less dependant on cars and traffic in our planning. Residents' concerns should be number one! This area is one of the areas in Carmel that is an affordable community, including the apartments. We don't want to see that destroyed—where would the people go?

Philomina Squier, 1315 Lawrence Road, referred to a chart that is included in the Comprehensive Plan under Chapter 5—Growth Policies Plan. Under neighborhood commercial, support circulation—"the site must have direct access to regular access without traffic intrusion into adjoining neighborhoods. With the access proposed into Auman Drive, that is a lot of traffic in an adjoining neighborhood. Question is: Who is going to pay for all of the roadway improvements on 126th Street—the taxpayers who don't want this to begin with?

Paul Davis, 320 East 126th Street, 32-year resident, had a lot of questions: When will 126th Street be widened—before or after the start of construction? How wide will 126th be upon completion of roadway improvements? What roadway improvements will be done at the intersection of Auman Drive and 126th Street? Five years ago, 116th Street was to be widened at Merchants Square—it is still not widened! Traffic now backs up from Keystone to Rangeline between 7 and 8 AM and between 4 and 6 PM with traffic as it is now—with more homes, where will the traffic go? There could possibly be 2000 more people moving on 126th Street going to Keystone.

John Sullivan, President of The Enclave HOA. (Submitted some material from Auman Addition) The commercial parking for the proposed use in Gramercy—where will that occur? Will they park in The Enclave, across the street? Is that included in the traffic plan? The entrance from Mohawk Hills is directly across the entrance to The Enclave and we have a tremendous amount of traffic. Has A & F done any study on that? Will the City retain its own traffic engineer for an unbiased report? A & F is working for and being paid by Gramercy—who is working for the residents of Carmel? Nobody! Are the developers taxpayers in Carmel? Installing two northern entrances to Mohawk on 126th Street and moving them about 100 feet to the west and installing a left turn lane as is west of Keystone on Carmel Drive would prevent traffic from coming directly into The Enclave. If this does not happen, we will have to ask that our community be "gated." Keystone: In my mind, the ingress/egress onto Keystone Avenue is key to this project; if the developer is not successful in obtaining that—the whole thing should

disappear. We should also know what they are doing. The developer says they don't know—they would not put \$40 million into this project and anticipate another \$100 million into if they "don't know." There is no final, ultimate traffic plan for Keystone. So, we are putting 2,000 living units and a commercial project basically right in the middle of downtown Carmel with no way to get in and no way to get out—when we have the exact same thing three blocks away.

Tom Meganheart, 11938 Eastwick Circle, resident since 1960. Mr. Meganheart remembers when Carmel had no traffic—he likes Carmel better with traffic. Traffic is not a bad thing; traffic congestion is. Traffic brings jobs, traffic brings businesses, traffic brings increased property values. As long as traffic is managed well by competent people who do a good development, as a resident of Carmel, I want traffic. I know what it has done for me and for employment. Carmel today is a whole lot better place than when there was no traffic years ago. Traffic is not a bad name—congestion is.

Tim McDonald, Lawrence Drive, only wanted to discuss westbound traffic on 126th Street. At the previous meeting with Gramercy, the traffic engineer said that there was a portion of the project outside his purview, and he was not concerned with the existing level of service at this intersection. Mr. McDonald wanted to give a clear picture of just how bad this intersection is. The traffic is not up by 1 ½%, it has gone up three times in ten years traveling westbound. A significant portion of the time it takes to get from 126th to I-465 has gone from 5 minutes to 15 minutes. A significant portion of that time is getting on to Keystone. The intersection at 126th and Keystone is inferior. The left turn lane is too short, there is a temporary, unofficial right turn lane, the traffic mixes up and does not make maximum of the green time at the light. The traffic backs up three blocks to Lawrence Road.

Angie Molton, (sp?) 740 West Auman Drive, had questions as to where the numbers came from. The proposal states that the land uses are proposed but not limited to—what numbers? In other words, how much commercial, how much residential, how many restaurants—what were the numbers used to come up with the traffic generated by Gramercy? There is not enough information given to the residents. Another concern is the timing of construction. Ms. Molton lives at the northern end of Auman and if construction starts in the northwest corner, what will be put into place to accommodate the neighborhood residents and children at the school bus stop. If the developer is not successful in getting an access point at Keystone and farther south onto Carmel Drive, do you foresee the City having to run roads through our homes to connect the four roads to accommodate traffic for this development? Ms. Molton would not want to see that—it would be THEIR property at the expense of hers.

Jeff Havens, 240 Shoshone, as former police officer, one of the things noticed already is the amount of cut-through traffic in Mohawk Addition. Once traffic emerges from Gramercy into the four points, there is no way to control speed limits or what route they take. Mr. Havens suggested that there be a dedicated egress only for Gramercy Park that would not allow either their traffic to enter our neighborhood or Auman Addition to enter Gramercy.

Barry Reynolds, 132 Ute, Newark Village. Mr. Reynolds asked "Why Auman at all?" Secondly, 50 cars is a lot of cars and a lot of people that won't be able to get out of their

driveway. Most of the residents have already figured out routes out of the Subdivision, just to go south is no help at all—it will end up being just a cut-through for a lot of the activities that will happen in the future with the Arts & Design District and Civic Center. Opposed to cut-through traffic.

Rebuttal: Steve Fehribach referred to the 50 vehicles and whether or not the roads could handle that. The engineers measure by capacity; typically in neighborhood streets, one lane of traffic could handle up to 1500 vehicles in one hour if they do not have to stop. Adding an additional 50 cars to Auman Drive will not cause any additional delay or capacity problems along the corridor. The total number of vehicles on a daily basis crossing into Auman Addition is not calculated at this time. The total number of cars for the development—again, we look at peak hour—that calculation can be made.

Who pays for the roadway improvements and when? The answer is unknown at this time. The timeline for 126th Street? The development will not be completed overnight and 126th Street should be in place when the volumes dictate the need. The number can be calculated by using a phasing-type study.

Madeleine Torres asked about the east and west bound traffic on 126th Street and the number of lanes. Is A&F Engineering recommending dedicated left turn, right turn, and through lanes in each direction?

Steve Fehribach's response: There would be a through lane in the west-bound direction; next to it would be a continuous left turn lane so that you could turn left into any of the proposed Gramercy access points. East-bound, there would be a continuous left turn lane or continuous through lane so people could either turn left into The Enclave or they could go all the way to the intersection of Keystone Avenue and get into either a through lane or left turn lane. There will be a continuous right turn lane so that people could turn directly into this development. There will be four (4) twelve-foot lanes across the frontage of this development. How wide will 126th Street be? 48 feet is recommended (4, twelve-foot lanes.) The capacity is about a 24-foot wide road.

Susan Westermeier asked if A & F Engineering had looked at the intersection at 126th and Range Line Road—people do travel west on 126th Street, west of Keystone—not everyone travels east and then south.

Steve Fehribach responded that traffic was projected that would go west. One situation we have not really looked at yet is the four-way stop on 126th Street--Auman Drive on the south and Lexington on the north. The 4-way stop does create a delay; at some point in time, 4-way stops reach capacity. We will probably have to look at that, but we have not gone down to 126th and Range Line Road for this project. A & F has looked at that intersection several times for the City for other projects; the amount of traffic from this development to that intersection would be handled at that intersection, but this study does not include that.

Regarding the cut-through traffic to The Enclave—the traffic engineers did drive The Enclave corridor along with the corridor in the neighborhood to the north; however, we did not take a look at people that would cut through between the current apartments—we will follow up on that.

Westbound traffic: Mr. McDonald is correct. In the westbound traffic at 126th and Keystone, the lanes are not long enough. The left turns trying to get onto Keystone actually block the through lane at some point. The recommendation on this approach is to add a left, a through, and a right turn lane. We would then have an additional lane—people are making their own lane now because people are trying to get through. Our recommendation is to improve this intersection.

Access to Auman Drive: There are no plans to run any roads through any houses right now. This development would not cause the need to do that. Regarding the traffic through the Auman Addition neighborhood, there are various traffic calming devices if the speed increases, but the way traffic moves through this neighborhood—angles, stop signs, etc. help to reduce the speed. There may be additional things necessary to reduce the speed and we can look at those.

Why Auman? Are 50 cars a lot? 50 cars across four driveways or 12 ½ cars per driveway—that would be on an hourly basis. You might get one car every ten minutes across each of the access points—not an excessive amount of traffic. On an overall “U” to get people to move back and forth across there, it will help the system across 126th Street, across Range Line Road, and across Carmel Drive.

David Leazenby responded to the question about the proposed uses being open-ended. The way the PUD Ordinance is written, it contains a list of uses that are permitted and by design, the neighborhood is meant to have a mixture of uses. In that mix, some assumptions were made in the study. The design as presented to the Plan Commission is to have a variety of uses and a mixture of housing types. The parking is to be handled in on-street parking and parking structures. Parking is not anticipated at The Enclave—the commercial uses are designed towards the southern part of the site. The design then is to be pedestrian friendly with a mixture of uses—there will be some reduction in traffic just by the mixture of uses. Not everyone must get into his car to drive to get a gallon of milk—they could walk a few blocks. By design, this is a different way of living—it will be more pedestrian friendly. The petitioner will continue working with the City. The City Engineer’s office reviews Steve Fehribach’s work. The City Engineer will also help determine the timing of roadway improvements on 126th Street in conjunction with this project. The City also has plans for Auman Drive and 126th Street; the 5-year old plans have not yet been taken to construction and are being reviewed again with the proposed project in mind to see how it would all fit and accomplish. Paying for the improvements: We are in the preliminary talking stages with the City and analyzing the overall improvements in the core of Carmel are already on the books and already planned. In working with Steve Fehribach, the study will determine what actually needs to be done; the cost is anticipated to be incorporated into the project—but how dollars are allocated has not yet been determined.

Jim Shinaver, final comments: After the Commission meeting on the 21st of February, an additional neighborhood meeting was held with the residents of Auman Drive and the residents of Cool Creek neighborhood east of Keystone, north of 126th Street. During one of those meetings, the question was asked about construction traffic. What was explained at that time was that if the rezone is approved, we would have to come back for ADLS/DP approval for any particular section that we would want to develop. Assuming that approval is granted, the construction traffic issue would be discussed at that time. The petitioner would also have to go through the Board of Public Works in conjunction with the Department of Engineering so that the appropriate entrances could be established—construction traffic, where construction trailers may be located, etc. Also mentioned during the neighborhood meeting: the Buckingham Companies has been involved in the development business for a number of years and they understand the importance of construction traffic, construction trailers, etc. and would be sensitive to those types of issues.

Can separate roadways be designated for the residents of Auman Drive and a separate type of dedicated drive for the residents of Gramercy? The only observation made is that the zoning ordinance does require connections to adjacent roadways. The Plan Commission has dealt with this issue on many, many occasions. The belief is that there are certain sections of the western part of Clay Township where, historically, those connections did not occur and years later it resulted in difficulty with traffic flow because there were no alternate “release valves.” Part of the reason for that is not only traffic flow but also for perpetual integration of neighborhoods.

As it relates to traffic, one of the speakers mentioned traffic versus congestion. The Urban Design Initiative in the central core study for Carmel does propose a different vision for the central core of Carmel and with that comes certain traffic considerations. The petitioner does not believe that what he is proposing is inconsistent with that particular vision. However, we will continue to work on the issues.

With the special meeting on March 16, 2006, if acceptable to the Commission Committee members, the petitioner would like to talk about some of the other aspects of the project so that traffic could be revisited at another meeting after the 16th of March.

Department Comments, Christine Holmes: As noted by the petitioner, the Department has not yet received formal review from the Engineering office, although they did indicate that they want to see more numbers. The planning staff as well would like to see more cross-sections of streets, more numbers for those streets, street widths, and more detail on how that will all be handled. The Dept. staff has an interest in AAA Way as well and how that will connect—the concern from a planning standpoint is that AAA Way will lead into what will be the commercial heart of the project. AAA Way also represents what could be an additional cut from Carmel Drive to 126th Street—more information is required. Regarding parking on Auman Drive—anytime there is a project this size, it will have an impact on the surrounding area; the planning staff would like to minimize the impact as much as possible. There are several possible design solutions to the parking on Auman Drive that will still maintain the neighborhood feel of both Auman Addition and Gramercy. One of the ways this can be done is having the houses in Gramercy face the houses on Auman Drive, lighting the walkways to the sidewalks and providing parking areas

such as parking courts internal to the development—all these would lessen the impact on Auman Drive. This can be looked at later in the development stage. The Department is awaiting comments from the City Engineers.

Leo Dierckman then announced that **Docket No. 05120025 Z Gramercy PUD (Mohawk Hills Redevelopment)** would be **continued** to a special meeting of the Special Studies Committee to be held Thursday, **March 16 at 6:00 PM. The Topic for the next meeting will deal with Basic Design Issues--traffic issues will resume on March 30, 2006.) The meeting will be held in the Council Chambers subject to availability.**

2. Docket No. 05120018 DP/ADLS: Old Meridian Professional Building (Pinnacle Pointe)

The applicant seeks to create a 2 story, 19,526 sq. ft. medical office building on 2.44 ac. The site is located at 12065 Old Meridian St. and is zoned B-6 within the US 31 Overlay. Filed by Kevin Roberts of DeBoy Land Development for Allen Commercial Group.

Paul Reis, attorney, appeared before the Commission representing the applicant. Also present: Bob Wildman, attorney representing Allen Commercial Group; Ton Aldrichson, Chris Hovey, Sean Curran, architect, Mike DeBoy and Kevin Roberts from DeBoy Land Development Services, Engineering.

The site is located at the corner of Old Meridian and Pennsylvania Street, currently undeveloped land. This project is basically for the relocation of two existing medical practices in Carmel: Pediatric Physician Group and an ENT Group. The proposed buildings are approximately 19,520 square feet. The project is somewhat difficult to site plan because of the location and the convergence of the two streets as well as the upgrades to Old Meridian Street and the northern portion of Pennsylvania Street in this area.

There have been discussions with the City Engineer regarding using the right-of-way for some of the landscaping because of parking needs. We also discussed bringing the building to the right-of-way line. Mike McBride and Gary Duncan have suggested that the Engineering Department would be willing to vacate a portion of the existing right-of-way and that gave the petitioner an additional five (5) feet to move the building and open up the additional right-of-way and landscaping along Pennsylvania Street. The site plan reflects the site after the round about is constructed.

Another topic of discussion with the Engineer was the walking path. At this point in time, the Engineer's office and DOCS agree that the pedestrian path will move south to connect with future development along Pennsylvania Street.

The petitioner has made dramatic changes to the site and is close to obtaining requisite landscaping for the site. By moving the building to the Old Meridian right-of-way line, the petitioner will have to address the 20 foot build-to line on Pennsylvania Street; the 10-foot planting strip will now be in the right-of-way and an Agreement to Encroach will be negotiated

with the Board of Public Works & Safety—the City Engineer is supportive of this course of action.

The petitioner will be seeking a waiver of the foundation plantings around the building. The petitioner has attempted to maximize the plantings in this area utilizing grasses in addition to typical shrubs and trees. There is also landscaping along Pennsylvania Street.

At present, there are unresolved, technical issues--primarily the drainage of the site. There is no on-site detention. Initially, the storm water was to discharge onto the John Kirk property and that is the current plan the petitioner is proceeding with. The consulting engineer for the City has suggested additional studies, but we feel that it is appropriate for the Plan Commission to deal with the DP/ADLS issues at this point and move the project forward. Quite frankly, if the drainage does not work, the project will not be built. Most of the Engineering issues have been resolved regarding the right-of-way. There are some open items regarding commitments, but those will be worked out and forthcoming.

Scott Brewer has reviewed the landscape plans and has some concern with the landscape islands as far as the soils. Again, the petitioner will be seeking a variance for foundation plantings.

The petitioner has filed a new photometric plan with a 25-foot pole per the Ordinance. In regard to the path, the open issue is whether or not there would be a connection to the path; however, the site is quite small and the petitioner feels there is very easy access to walk—there will not be much traffic through this area and people will be able to walk out the building and easily access the path on Pennsylvania Street. Hopefully, as more development occurs in this area, there will be a path on the other side that would take people into the Old Meridian District.

Department Report, Christine Holmes: As noted by the petitioner, there are a few outstanding issues. The Dept. believes the path should be put in to connect to the pedestrian connection to the structure—it provides for a logical shortcut and this can be done with pavers. There is a lighting plan on file. What about signage? Most of the unresolved concerns have been addressed, but there are still some fairly significant concerns that remain. The Department is recommending this item be continued to the March 30, 2006 meeting.

Paul Reis said the exact design of signage is not known at this point.

Leo Dierckman asked for public input at this point; no one appeared.

Paul Reis addressed the following items in the Department Report:.
Up-grades to Pennsylvania, the petitioner is dedicating the additional right-of-way on Pennsylvania as required.

Signage: The petitioner anticipates two signs on each side and the petitioner will return with a detailed sign package. A variance will be needed for the signage.

Landscape plan: The plan has been submitted; the petitioner has followed the species and guidelines provided by Scott Brewer, and there is possibly a concern about some of the islands. Those issues can be addressed easily and it is not seen as a major point.

Building materials have been shown. The light plan has been submitted. There is a 10-foot path along Pennsylvania Street—the path will actually be moved into the right-of-way because that is part of the Federal project. As far as the connection from the building, if it is safe enough to walk from a parking space to the front of the building, it should be safe enough to walk two more feet into the path. We can look into that—perhaps striping the access. The drainage is highly technical. There will be more studies done, but the petitioner feels this will be resolved. Again, no permit would be issued before the drainage is resolved.

Bob Wildman, Allen Commercial Group addressed the Committee. The issue being juggled with the tenants is that there are two physician practices that will occupy 100% of the building and they are moving from an existing space and timing is very important. The 16th would be workable, followed by the full Commission meeting on the 21st.

Docket No. 05120018 DP/ADLS, Old Meridian Professional Building (Pinnacle Pointe) was referred to the special meeting of the Special Studies Committee on **March 16, 2006** at 6:00 PM and ultimately to the March 21, 2006 Plan Commission meeting.

NOTE: Items 3 and 4 were heard together

3. Docket No. 05110020 DP/ADLS: Old Meridian Place

The applicant seeks to create 129 townhomes and a mix of office and retail uses on 25 acres.

The site is located at 12852 Old Meridian Street and is zoned OM/SFA.

Filed by Jon Isaacs for Centex Homes.

Larry Kemper and Jim Shinaver, attorneys with Nelson & Frankenberger appeared before the Committee representing Centex Homes. Also present: Jon Isaacs, Centex Homes; Gordon Cripe, Stoeppelwerth & Assoc.; Terry Smith and Dan O'Malley, Bloodgood, Sharpe & Buster, architectural firm in Chicago, Illinois.

This property is located southwest of the intersection of Main Street and Old Meridian. Centex originally filed the ADLS and DP applications for this site in October, 2005. In December, 2005, it was determined that a 4-acre portion of this site would need to be rezoned due to the types of buildings being proposed for the area from Old Meridian Single Family Attached and Old Meridian Special Use to Old Meridian Mixed Use. The Plan Commission public hearing on the ADLS/DP occurred December 20, 2005; the public hearing on the rezone application appeared February 21, 2006.

Since the December 20th hearing, this matter has been continued twice—January and February. The reasons included uncertainty as far as improvements to Old Meridian and some other uncertainties and factors that have impacted the site design. Also, Centex has actively been

pursuing additional parcels. For those reasons, the final site plan was uncertain and the petitioner continued both the January and February meetings.

Since then, Centex has obtained two signed letters of intent for a two-acre parcel adjacent to this site. An amended Development Plan application and amended ADLS application were also filed. There have now been three separate filings. Because the rezone and DP/ADLS are all related, it is desirous of bringing these all together in the same time frame and this has been noticed for the March 21, 2006 Plan Commission meeting. The petitioner would also ask that the rezone heard at Plan Commission on the 21st be forwarded to the City Council. However, the petitioner would return to this Committee showing more detailed plans regarding the DP/ADLS for the entirety of the site. This evening the petitioner is asking that the Rezone be forwarded to the Plan Commission for a vote on March 21st.

Jim Shinaver then addressed the Committee and explained the timing of this Docket. By bringing the two additional rezone parcels into play, the petitioner is in a better position to make use of the real estate. March 16th the petitioner would be able to continue any detail discussion as it relates to the rezone phase. A portion of the DP and ADLS approval would still remain with Plan Commission review as the rezone is taken through the process.

At this time, Centex is only proceeding with the ADLS for the townhome portion and the podium buildings; it is not proceeding with ADLS for the mixed-use buildings—Centex anticipates another developer returning at a later date to go through the ADLS process for those buildings. Centex will be proceeding with the Development Plan for the entirety of the site, specifically for the purpose of establishing location of the building pads, internal roadways, internal parking, and underground detention and basic infrastructure.

There have been some changes to the site plan since the last review. The 2.3-acre parcel was added. The podium buildings have been turned so that they are perpendicular to Main Street and a third podium building has been added. A row of townhomes has been added along the internal roadway. The roadway has been lowered so as to align with the median cut on Old Meridian. Some parking has been added and expanded so that at some point in the future, parking may be shared with the Church.

Dan O'Malley, partner with Bloodgood, Sharpe & Buster, architectural planners located in Chicago, appeared before the Committee. Effectively, Mr. O'Malley wanted to address the designs and vision for the community. This proposal is seen as a mixed-use community—an urban village—that is a blend of residential units, retail, and office. There would be a significant blend of buyers that would be attracted to this community as well. Moreover, this is a community designed to be very pedestrian friendly; there are walking trails, walking paths, open space, park areas and connectivity through the site that is a significant component of the community. Lastly, this community is designed specifically to make cars seem to “go away.” Parking in the townhomes is tucked to the back of the building; the front of the building is designed to form good streetscapes and become an architectural dominant part of the community. One of the buildings is three stories, parking, 27 units. Another element of the site is a building that might be attractive to empty nesters; another building would be designed in a

more contemporary life-style. Ultimately the design of the buildings is intended to come across with some undulation in the roof, parapets and window patterns that are predominately masonry construction. The building design is not intended to be homogenized throughout the community. We expect to see different looks, different textures, and different characteristics of the buildings throughout.

Department Comments, Christine Holmes: It looks as if some of the concerns outlined in the Department Report have been addressed. The primary concern is the townhouse architecture and elevations submitted. Some of the concerns remain with building 5 and the window frames; the Staf would like to see more permeability, pedestrian friendly, and more visibility to make the construction safer. The Department is still awaiting some information from TAC comments and the landscape plan. The Department is recommending this docket be continued to the 30th of March.

Leo Dierckman asked about a traffic study.

Jim Shinaver responded that the Department had not requested a traffic study, therefore a study was not prepared. The petitioner met recently with Scott Brewer and Matt Griffin regarding landscape issues as they relate to this project. Jon Isaacs will revisit the landscape, revise and re-submit to the Department for review and comment. TAC comments are still in the process of being addressed.

Jon Isaacs with Centex Homes commented on the design of the buildings, different style brick, siding material, etc. that can satisfy the concern regarding the monotony. The architectural enhancement is an ADLS review. The petitioner has designed the site to bring the road cut down to meet the median cut that is shown on the Old Meridian Plan and on-street parking has been provided on all of the roadways within the development. By separating the buildings through the roadway system and also by incorporating a larger parking lot behind the buildings to the north, the petitioner has included the ability for something to happen with the church property to the north. One of the concerns earlier was that with the podium buildings along the property line adjacent to the church, we were really sealing the fate of the church property as far as future marketability. The current proposal will allow the development to flow into the church property. Building #5 is geared to young professional; the buildings are one story, flat unit over the garage and recreational facility. There will be a pool in this building and if the building includes an elevator, it will open the access more to empty-nesters.

Leo Dierckman said that it would be great to have the Church involved and be an active part.

Jim Shinaver responded that there was interest on Centex' part and discussions have occurred; however, the Church was unsure if they wanted to stay, sell, or build a new facility.

Docket No. 05110020 DP/ADLS: Old Meridian Place was continued to the special meeting of the Special Studies Committee to be held March 16, 2006 at 6:00 PM for further review.

4. Docket No. 06010002 Z: Old Meridian Place Rezone

S:/PlanCommission/Minutes/Committees/SpecialStudiesCommittee/2006/mar07

17

The applicant seeks to rezone 3.084 acres from Old Meridian Single Family Attached (OM/SFA) to Old Meridian Mixed Use (OM/MU) for the purpose of creating mixed use structures along Old Meridian Street. This project is in conjunction with the proposed Old Meridian Place development.

The site is located at 12852 Old Meridian Street and is zoned OM/SF.

Filed by Lawrence Kemper of Nelson & Frankenberger for Centex Homes.

Continued to the March 16, 2006 Special Meeting of the Special Studies Committee.

5. Docket No. 05120026 Z and 05120027 DP/ADLS: Village Green PUD

The applicant seeks to rezone 9.42 acres from R-2?Residential to PUD/Planned Unit Development for the purpose of creating 50 townhomes.

The site is located at 211 West Smokey Row Road.

Filed by Jim Shinaver of Nelson and Frankenberger for Bay Development Co. and Drees Premiere Homes Inc.

Jim Shinaver, attorney with Nelson & Frankenberger appeared before the Committee representing the applicant. Also present: Bruce Sklare, Bay Development; John Talbott and Dawn Barnett, Drees Homes; Jim Shields, Weihe Engineers; Matt Brown, traffic engineer with A & F Engineering; John Lapp, Landscape Architect.

The subject site is approximately 9 acres in size located south of and adjacent to Smokey Row Road and west of and adjacent to the Monon Trail. The revised site plan and re-designed landscape plan for this project were distributed this evening; revisions were made as a result of comments made at Technical Advisory Committee. Two units have been eliminated from the original proposal, adjusted to 48 townhome units. Part of the reduction in the units was to accommodate a retention pond in the southeast corner of the real estate as well as addressing some other site issues so that the petitioner could accommodate some of the buffering requirements through the landscape ordinance.

There is a significant portion of the western part of the site that is not undergoing development; we are focusing more on the eastern portion of the property. The revised plans should show an asphalt path adjacent to 136th Street—the path is 10 feet in width. The on-street parking originally shown adjacent to 136th Street has been eliminated so that the petitioner can continue to address issues that relate to the entrance of the site in the adjacent roadway so that proper ingress and egress can be provided for vehicular traffic. Also, on the southern portion of the property, a connection is shown adjacent to the southern property line. The Zoning Ordinance requires these types of connections to adjacent parcels.

The building design, treatment of color schemes, the placement of windows, detail around the windows, the design of the garage doors and the entry ways as well as the bay window treatment and roofline treatment are all unique and demonstrate a good development in the types of townhomes seen.

At the time the informational packets were submitted for the February 21st meeting, the rear elevation did not do justice to the time and effort involved in designing the rear of these units. In addition to the window treatment, the deck treatment, the roofline design, there is a significant architectural break to the back of the units that will be visually attractive, especially since a certain number of units that will be adjacent to the Monon Trail. There is a significant tree line between the Monon Trail and the proposed development that will provide a certain amount of shielding, the petitioner is proposing additional perimeter buffering in the landscape plan. At the same time, the petitioner has also gone into extra detail and effort as to how the rear of the buildings will appear and make sure they have architectural relief to them that would eliminate the monotonous appearance along the rear.

Regarding unresolved issues set forth in the Staff Report: Item 1 relates to required upgrades for Smokey Row Road and coordination with the City Engineering Dept. regarding these types of improvements. The petitioner will continue to meet with the Dept. of Engineering so that this particular issue can continue to be addressed. Item 3 refers to an improved landscape plan and what is shown is a revised plan that was prepared as recently as today based on some site changes made. Copies of the landscape plan will be forwarded to Scott Brewer, Urban Forester and Matt Griffin at DOCS so they can be reviewed; a follow up meeting will be scheduled so that any additional comments or concerns can be addressed. It is the Staff's policy that landscape issues are addressed prior to being removed from the Committee process back to the full Commission. Item 4 regarding TAC comments dated January 6, 2006: The understanding is that the TAC meeting occurred on January 18 and some of the response letters were received following the meeting. We are still in the process of reviewing the information and providing appropriate responses. The petitioner understands that in order to get through the Committee process and back to the full Commission, we will need to have resolution of those issues.

Finally, there was a request by the Department regarding Monon Trail access to the site, preferably to the south next to the detention pond—this is a critical access point and the project provides an opportunity to provide the pedestrian link to the park. John Talbott did have conversations with Mark Westermeier of the Parks Department and at this time, the Parks Dept. may have a preference not to provide that connection. We will continue to follow up with Mark Westermeier in order to confirm that; it may be appropriate to obtain a letter to that effect. The Staff's request for that connection has been made on other projects and there is value in that type of request, however, members of the Parks Board may have a different opinion on that issue. It is important for the petitioner to work with all parties that have an interest in this issue and hopefully come to a consensus—then petitioner would then be able to follow through.

Matt Brown, A & F Engineering then addressed the Committee regarding the traffic study for this development. There was a question about the study counts—probably 3 or 4 traffic counts have been done at Range Line Road and 136th Street. Sorting through the studies, it boils down to one that was developed in August when school was in session and one developed in late June, before school started. Those were the two highest counts at the intersection of Range Line and 136th Street, the difference being that with the school, the peak hour starts earlier because there is an influx of students passing through the intersection to get to school—without the students, the peak starts a little later. The traffic volumes at the intersection are different by about 100 to 120

when school is in session. Nonetheless, the traffic volumes are comparable between the two; it is the movements that change. Because this particular development is located west of this intersection, we are particularly interested in vehicles leaving this development and turning left—that is the most critical movement coming out of this development. The highest traffic count was from the June count in front of the development with traffic approaching from the east and those traffic volumes were used to develop the analysis for this development. We also prepared an additional analysis for the school count. Basically the level of service changes at Range Line, at the access they are all the same. There are small increases or decreases in delay, but no more improvements are needed, no additional turn lanes, etc. We are dealing with equal counts, different dates, and slightly different volumes, but the results are the same.

Department Report, Christine Holmes: The petitioner has addressed some of the issues, however, the Dept. is asking that the elevations would be revisited—bump-outs make a tremendous difference. Looking at the front elevations and the rear elevations, there is such a difference, especially the elevations that will face the Monon—even something as simple as changing the colors of hardi-plank on the back to match the colors on the front will make a huge difference. Access to the Monon should be provided; otherwise, people will create their own access if at all possible. Of course, the Department will defer to the Parks Department. There are still some outstanding issues with landscaping, engineering and TAC comments, the Department is asking that this Docket be referred to the March 30th Special Studies Committee meeting.

Public Comments:

Curt Janeke, Carmel Residents for Historic Preservations, said the project takes in an Urban Forest and 60-70% of the forest not in the flood plain would be eliminated. With the R-2 zoning, up to 18 homes could be put on this 9-acre site. The area encompasses Little Cool Creek and a section of the property connects to Meadowlark Park. Little Cool Creek is in a flood plain. The reason the design is situated in an “L” shape is because this is the only section that is not in the flood plan. Permitting this PUD project as currently proposed would endanger our environment, the cultural heritage of Carmel, and it would also be a traffic concern. This proposal would also negatively affect the wildlife in this area that includes: red-tail hawk, screech owl, Great Horned Owl, raccoons, fox, opossum, squirrels, Turkey Vultures. For eleven years, Carmel has been awarded a Tree City USA designation and Mayor Brainard has publicly recognized the value of trees and monitors through Scott Brewer, the Urban Forester. If this property is rezoned, it will eliminate seven trees with a trunk diameter of 48 inches. A walk of the property in the “L” shaped area proposed reveals 7 trees—48 inches excess. The Sycamore is the biggest tree on the lot in excess of 60 inches at the base and would be next to the drainage pond being proposed. There are 27 trees on this site that are in excess of 24 inches plus some larger one—that is over 30 trees that would be in the “kill zone.” The area of tree preservation has big trees on it, but it is also in the flood plain. Mr. Janeke requested that a wetland study be done on this site. Secondly a Forestry Analysis should be done that would confirm the walk done on this property. Mr. Janeke has also requested that a State Forester visit the site along with Scott Brewer, Urban Forester, to talk about the number of trees that would come down as a result of this building concept. Mr. Janeke requested that the area remain R-2/Residential that would permit 18 residential units.

Craig Hall, Carmel resident, offered several comments from a neighbor, **Chris Stormer**. Mr. Hall referred to a vision statement from the City Website....”Carmel: A dynamic edge city with award-winning tools, pride in businesses, family oriented neighborhoods, and a city committed to preserving its vitality through controlled expansion and prudent planning.” What happens to this Statement of Vision when hundreds of townhomes are added to this community? This once small, unique and quaint town will become just a northern extension of Indianapolis metropolis. Peak developments such as the Village Green not only contradicts this theme but also directly affects the quality of life. We want safety for our children and also quality education through the school system. Carmel is usually one of the top three schools in the State and is noted for student achievement and high test scores, including ISTEP. The smaller class size cultivates student development. Our children are our future and the Plan Commission needs to look at the future of Carmel. Carmel is unique, quaint, charming and historic. The residents have never opposed the creation of the Arts & Design District. Where is the art and design in several hundred, brand new, similar-looking three-story townhomes? In an article in the 2004 Indianapolis Star, Mayor Brainard stated that Carmel wanted to benchmark Naperville, Illinois, a western Chicago suburb. A neighbor of Mr. Craig’s came to Carmel from Naperville and commented that Naperville has its own identity while limiting the number of townhomes. To keep Carmel one of the best places to live, we can start by keeping townhomes in surrounding cities and allowing Old Town to maintain its distinctive character.

Another point is property values and property taxes. Mr. Hall referred to an article in the Wall Street Journal on February 28, 2006 that new home sales, including townhomes, fell 5% nationwide and the number of unsold homes on the market rose to its highest level in 10 years, signifying a “cooling down” in the housing market.

Jenny Justain, 511 Second Avenue, stated concern with increased traffic as a result of the number of townhomes being built and noted each location where townhomes have been approved and are being constructed, including adjacent to the High School Football Stadium. Traffic is a major issue on narrow roads with no to inadequate turn lanes. Referring to the traffic study, Ms. Justain questioned the timing of the traffic study—June and August.

Janet Baylock, 411 First Avenue NW, asked that while Carmel is forging ahead with new construction and changing the face and the image of the City, and creating beauty and physical growth in once blighted areas, PLEASE stop short of destroying the footprint of Carmel’s history! Old Town is not the place to construct another enclave of multi-story, red brick townhomes. Residents of the Old Town area have presented statistical analysis that suggests that 300 townhomes slated for construction in the area will create a traffic issue that will not be able to be addressed due to the existing, narrow roads and the closeness of the new structures. Other residents have urged the Commission to consider an ever-growing strain on the school system, the school system that is heralded as a premiere educational facility but that is already showing strains by its inability or unwillingness to maintain the financial contributions necessary to attract and retain the top teachers in the country. Others point to the environmental impact of the roughly 600 extra vehicles that will add to the pollution levels in our community and to the devastation of the wildlife by the reckless destruction of their habitat. Asthma sufferers can attest to the need to preserve old tree growth and green space and limit further congestion and

pollution to the air. These are all valid points individually; together they make an impressive argument as to why you should not allow the rezoning of the Old Town area. Ms. Baylock asked the Commission to oppose this zoning request and those that come after that would seek to destroy what we so desperately need to preserve—our history! Don't lose sight of the beauty and attractiveness of the historic area we call Old Town. Please vote to preserve what the City designers have already deemed to be a place worth preserving. Vote to keep Old Town from becoming another new development; please vote "No" to rezoning it out of existence.

Sumera Khan, 634 First Avenue, NW, questioned the Traffic Study that was made—who pays for the study? It cannot be independent if the developer pays for the study. Secondly, has any research been done on the supply/demand of townhomes and condos? Has anyone looked at the resale value of condos? There is an abundant supply of condos and townhomes, but we do not know what the demand is and what the resale value would be.

Barry Dockstater, 13559 Kensington Place, stated he moved to Carmel in 1994 because of the woods, the parks, the trail, shopping, and quality of life. Kensington was able to construct 16 units in an area that is probably 8 or 9 acres—very low density. All 16 units of Kensington have been certified by the Indiana Wildlife Federation as backyard wildlife habitats—the first community in the State. The current Carmel magazine features a story on Kensington and the backyard wildlife habitat. Planning can be done, but the more intense it is, the more difficult it is to work around the things citizens want done. High density is a real problem. There has been nothing said regarding cumulative impacts—the corridors, all those things that come together as far as affecting our quality of life. Please consider in planning.

Elizabeth "B.J." Casali, 722 Hawthorne Drive, also property owner of 646 First Avenue NW, occupied by son Jonathan. Ms. Casali asked Matt Brown to travel Smokey Row Road between the hours of 7:30 AM and 8:00 AM, starting at Gray Road and proceeding across to Old Meridian; then see what you have to do to turn left onto Old Meridian. Second concern: Pedestrian safety on the Monon if this development is to occur. The ingress/egress to the proposed development is so close to the Monon and traffic backs up so badly at different times of the day on Smokey Row that it truly is a hazard to the pedestrians, the bicyclists, and the skateboarders.

Bill Sanders, Old Town Carmel, was in favor of the design on the front of the buildings—they are attractive and the individuality of the different units coincides with an attempt at blending with the Old Town part of Carmel. Old Town is an eclectic mix of layout and design, architecture and building materials—not every fourth house is the same. Residents of Old Town would like to continue with what was started—the Mayor's revitalization—infrastructure, streets, signs—and attempting to preserve what is in existence. Perhaps we need to expand the overlay district. The purpose was to promote, protect public health, safety, comfort, convenience, general welfare, etc. and provide for consistent and coordinated treatment of the properties. The residents are looking for consistent diversity of the individual residences. The catch is that there are very few combined or multiple family projects and if there are, there is such an architectural design that sets them apart that they have their own individuality. That is what we are trying to look for—consistency in the downtown/old town area. We are looking for

a growth trend to preserve what is already there, to preserve what is there and expand upon it. The back elevations of the buildings do not show any individuality; the front side does have some uniqueness and sets it apart from the mix.

Leo Dierckman asked that the Staff meet with the petitioner regarding the rear elevations on the buildings. It would be interesting to see a comparison of the impact if the number of units was reduced from the current 48 units proposed to 18 units as zoned, indicating where the impact trees are located. The reality is we need to get a handle on the traffic and on the impact on the environment relative to this project.

Leo Dierckman also asked that a tree plan be provided for the benefit of the Committee as well as the remonstrators.

Sue Westermeier asked whether or not a wetlands study had been done and if one was required. Also, are there plans for roadway improvements to Smokey Row and Range Line Road and how close are the townhomes to the Monon?

Christine Barton-Holmes responded that a study had not been done—there is not a registered wetlands on site. However, the full Commission could require a wetlands study and the petitioner would submit the results of that study.

The petitioner said that the townhomes are 26 feet to the property line; however, the building setback has not yet been established.

Jim Shinaver will prepare a cross-section showing the location of the Monon Trail, the right-of-way that contains all of the trail property, and show distances where the back of building would be to the property line, the common line with the Monon, and also where the back of the building would be in conjunction with the actual trail. Jim Shinaver will also make a comparison with the Traditions on the Monon.

Docket Nos. 05120026 Z and 05120027 DP/ADLS: Village Green PUD were continued to the March 30, 2006 meeting of the Special Studies Committee at 6:00 PM in the Caucus Rooms of City Hall.

6. Docket No. 06010008 Z: Midtown Village PUD

The applicant seeks to rezone 18.82 acres from I-1/Industrial to PUD for the purpose of creating a mixed-use development.

The site is located at 510 Third Avenue SW and is zoned I-1/Industrial.

Filed by Lawrence Kemper of Nelson and Frankenberger for Centex Homes.

Jon Isaacs, Centex Homes appeared before the Committee representing the applicant. Also in attendance: Terry Smith and Dan O'Malley, architects from Chicago, Illinois.

Terry Smith, land planner with Bloodgood, Sharpe & Buster, Chicago, Illinois addressed the Committee. Mr. Smtih said he had walked the site with the petitioner to get a feel for the site

and surrounding area. There is a wonderful opportunity at this location with the Monon Trail for recreational opportunities and also the fact that the site is wedged between the Arts District node to the north and the Civic Center node to the south offers other locational opportunities as well. There were some challenges with this project in that the project street throughout the entire mid-town area are somewhat choppy and do not connect well with the adjacent neighborhood and results in an area that is somewhat non-descript and fragmented. Another challenge is that the whole area shows how the parcels that comprise the mid-town area are oddly shaped and very different configurations.

The goal of the project—not just Centex but Carmel as well—is to follow the Urban Design Initiative and create a mixed-use development of retail, office, residential that would appeal to a different type of buyer, i.e. the young professional, active adult, empty-nester type of buyer, and to de-emphasize the automobile and create a pedestrian-friendly community.

In order for the Centex vision to occur with the City's vision of a mixed-use, node area, the development must take place in step with the parcel to the south and to the north. There are some things that can help tie all of these parcels together—one is the improvement and future alignment of Third Avenue; another consideration would be a strong pedestrian connection to the Monon Trail and also relationships to the Monon Trail. At the south end of the site there are two different types of row homes along Third Avenue—these are envisioned to be developed with on-street parking, nicely developed streetscape with pedestrian sidewalks, even perhaps a landscaped boulevard fronting some row homes. Additionally, there will be 12 luxury row homes that would front on the Monon Trail. There are rear-loaded garages behind the units with access to the parking garages and some guest parking as well.

On the west side of Third Avenue, the petitioner is proposing additional row homes that would be served by the east street that would connect into Third Avenue and terminate at a cul-de-sac. In the center of the cul-de-sac would be a small park. Pocket parks and pedestrian amenities will be a very important component or feature of this plan. North of the row homes on the east side of Third Avenue is a proposed, “U” shaped podium building that will have a parking garage and a small retail component on the first floor with three to four stories of residential above. The building is “U” shaped so that the courtyard faces north. North of the site is where the very apparent water tower and cell tower are located—these infrastructural pieces will not be “going away” anytime soon, so we will have to deal with them. The courtyard building to the north is oriented so that most of the units in this building will either face the interior courtyard or west of Third Avenue, south of the townhome area, or east of the Monon Trail. The building will be oriented so as to minimize the impact or number of units that actually face the water tower and cell tower. The parking level in this building will have 129 spaces that will serve a total of 81 units. The commercial component, located in the southwest corner, will be approximately 3,000 square feet.

The main mixed-use building is on the west side of Third Avenue and is designed as a pair of buildings, book-ended, with a club building in the center. In front of the mixed use building, along Third Avenue, is a retail component of approximately 12,000 square feet of total retail space. Behind the retail on the first level is a parking garage that will have 70 ground floor

spaces that will serve the three levels of residential, a total of 66 units above. The club facility will be two stories, approximately 10,000 square feet, with an outdoor pool area in back to the west. Because of more retail being proposed on the west side of the street, the petitioner thought it was important to create a bay of angled parking in front as opposed to parallel parking in order to create a few more parking spaces for the retail component. Additionally, there is more parking in the form of a surface parking lot south of Industrial Drive that will also serve not only retail but the proposed club building as well.

Dan O'Malley then addressed the Committee. There will be two townhome buildings along the Monon Trail; the garages are tucked away into rear corner positions. The buildings are a blend of a four-story and step-down to a three story building. Access off the Monon Trail has been planned at four points.

Jim Shinaver was hopeful that the review for the rezone could also be treated as if the petitioner were going for a DP/ADLS that would allow more focus on the design of the buildings. The review would affect not only the elevations but the interior of the buildings as well. It is an enormous endeavor to design the external shell of the building and fit the interior.

Department Comments, Christine Barton-Holmes: The Department is requesting that the petitioner commit to required up-grades on the rights-of-way and the re-alignment of Third Avenue and Fourth Street. At the next meeting, the petitioner should bring the rear elevations for discussion. The Department is also requesting a full site plan rather than cropped.

Docket No. 060100087 Z: Midtown Village PUD was continued to the Special Studies Committee on March 30, 2006 at 6:00 PM.

Carol Schleif, fellow Commission member, had some comments regarding the 5-story townhome. For those persons walking the Monon, it is depressing to see 5-stories—Ms. Schleif encouraged the petitioner to lower the height.

Jim Shinaver responded that the property is zoned I-1 and the 5-story height would be permitted; however, Jim Shinaver said he would check into it.

There was no further business and the meeting adjourned at 10:10 PM.

Leo Dierckman, Chairperson

Ramona Hancock, Secretary